

**Major contributor to AGN feedback:  
VLT X-shooter observations of S IV BAL QSO outflows<sup>1</sup>**

Benoit C.J. Borguet<sup>1</sup>, Nahum Arav<sup>1</sup>, Doug Edmonds<sup>1</sup>, Carter Chamberlain<sup>1</sup>, Chris Benn<sup>2</sup>

Version : September 16, 2012

Received \_\_\_\_\_; accepted \_\_\_\_\_

---

<sup>1</sup>Department of Physics, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA 24061; email: benbo@vt.edu

<sup>2</sup>Isaac Newton Group, Apartado 321, 38700 Santa Cruz de La Palma, Spain

## ABSTRACT

We present the most energetic BALQSO outflow measured to date, with a kinetic luminosity of at least  $10^{46}$  ergs  $s^{-1}$ , which is 5% of the bolometric luminosity of this high Eddington ratio quasar. The associated mass flow rate is 400 solar masses per year. Such kinetic luminosity and mass flow rate should provide strong AGN feedback effects. The outflow is located at about 300 pc from the quasar and has a velocity of roughly 8000 km  $s^{-1}$ . Our distance and energetic measurements are based in large part on the identification and measurement of S IV and S IV\* BALs. The use of this high ionization species allows us to generalize the result to the majority of high ionization BALQSOs that are identified by their C IV absorption. We also report the energetics of two other outflows seen in another object using the same technique. The distances of all 3 outflows from the central source (100-2000pc) suggest that we observe BAL troughs much farther away from the central source than the assumed acceleration region of these outflows (0.01-0.1pc).

*Subject headings:* galaxies: quasars — galaxies: individual (SDSS J1106+1939, SDSS J1512+1119) — line: formation — quasars: absorption lines

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Broad absorption line (BAL) outflows are observed as blueshifted troughs in the rest-frame spectrum of  $\sim 20\%$  of quasars (Hewett & Foltz 2003; Ganguly & Brotherton 2008; Knigge et al. 2008). The energy, mass, and momentum carried by these outflows are thought to play a crucial role in shaping the early universe and dictating its evolution (e.g. Scannapieco & Oh 2004; Levine & Gnedin 2005; Hopkins et al. 2006; Cattaneo et al. 2009; Ciotti et al. 2009, 2010; Ostriker et al. 2010). The ubiquity and wide opening angle deduced from the detection rate of these mass outflows, allows for efficient interaction with the surrounding medium, and these outflows carry thousands of times more mass flux per unit of kinetic luminosity than the collimated relativistic jets observed in 5 – 10% of all AGNs. Theoretical studies and simulations show that this so-called AGN feedback can provide an explanation for a variety of observations, from the chemical enrichment of the intergalactic medium, to the self regulation of the growth of the supermassive black-hole and of the galactic bulge (e.g. Silk & Rees 1998; Di Matteo et al. 2005; Germain et al. 2009; Hopkins et al. 2009; Elvis 2006, and references therein).

Quantifying AGN feedback requires estimating the kinetic luminosity ( $\dot{E}_k$ ) and mass-flow rate ( $\dot{M}$ ) of the outflows. These quantities can be computed in cases where we are able to estimate the distance  $R$  to the outflowing material from the central source (see Equations 6 and 7 in Borguet et al. 2012). Following the definition of the ionization parameter of the plasma  $U_H \propto 1/n_H R^2$  where  $n_H$  is the hydrogen number density, the distance can be obtained for outflows of known ionization state and density (see elaboration in Section 5). The research program developed by our team has led to the determination of  $\dot{M}$  and  $\dot{E}_k$  in several quasar outflows (e.g. Moe et al. 2009; Dunn et al. 2010; Bautista et al. 2010; Aoki et al. 2011; Borguet et al. 2012) by using the population ratio of

---

<sup>1</sup>Based on observations collected at the European Southern Observatory, Chile, PID:87.B-0229

collisionally excited states to the resonance levels of singly ionized species (e.g. Si II, Fe II) as density diagnostics (see Crenshaw et al. 2003, for a review). The lower detection rate of these low ionization outflows in spectroscopic surveys raises the question of whether the determinations obtained for these objects are representative of the ubiquitous high ionization C IV broad absorption line quasars (see Dunn et al. 2012, hereafter Paper I).

One way to alleviate this uncertainty is to target objects which possess absorption troughs from excited states of high ionization species, where S IV/S IV\*  $\lambda\lambda 1062.66, 1072.97$  are especially promising. These transitions appear at wavelengths blueward of Ly $\alpha$  and therefore suffer from blending with the Lyman forest in high redshift objects. However, since the ratio of C IV and S IV ionic fractions as a function of the ionization parameter ( $U_H$ ) is relatively constant (see paper I) they must arise from the same photoionized plasma. The ionization similarity of C IV and S IV makes S IV/S IV\* outflows a much better agent than the usual low ionization species for the determination of the feedback from the high ionization outflows (see discussion in Section 5.2). We consequently developed a research program that measured the sample properties of these S IV outflows (Paper I) and analyzed the photoionization and chemical abundances of one such outflow (Borguet et al. 2012b, hereafter paper II). In this paper, we present the analysis of VLT/X-shooter spectra of two SDSS BAL quasars, SDSS J1106+1939 and SDSS J1512+1119, for which the presence of S IV/S IV\* troughs allows us to place constraints on the location and energetics of the outflow in SDSS J1106+1939 and of two separate outflows in SDSS J1512+1119.

The plan of the paper is as follows: In § 2 we present the VLT/X-shooter observations of SDSS J1106+1939 and SDSS J1512+1119 along with the reduction of the data. In § 3 we identify the spectral features associated with S IV and S IV\* and measure the column densities for various ionic species associated with each outflow. Photoionization models are crucial for finding the total hydrogen column density of the outflows and their ionization equilibrium. We present these models in § 4. In § 5 we derive the parameters necessary to determine  $R$ ,  $\dot{E}_k$  and  $\dot{M}$  of the S IV outflows. In § 6, we evaluate the robustness of each step

in the analysis and conclude that  $\dot{E}_k = 10^{46}$  ergs s<sup>-1</sup> is a firm lower limit. We discuss our results in § 7.

## 2. OBSERVATIONS AND DATA REDUCTION

We selected our targets SDSS J1106+1939 (J2000: RA=11 06 45.05, dec=+19 39 29.1, g=19.4) and SDSS J1512+1119 (J2000: RA=15 12 49.29, dec=+11 19 29.4, g=17.7) from an extensive flux limited search of the SDSS DR7 catalog for objects indicative of the presence of S IV absorption on the basis of their SDSS spectrum. We observed these two objects with VLT/X-shooter as part of our program 87.B-0229 (PI: Benn) in April 2011 and March 2012, respectively. X-shooter is the second generation, medium spectral resolution ( $R \sim 6000\text{--}9000$ ) spectrograph installed at the Cassegrain focus of VLT/UT2 (Vernet et al. 2011). The unique design of the instrument, in which the incoming light is split into three independent arms (UVB, VIS and NIR) each composed of a prism-cross-dispersed echelle spectrograph, allows the simultaneous covering of a wide spectral band (3000 Å to 24000 Å) in a single exposure. The total integration time for each object in the UVB, VIS and NIR arms were 8400, 8400, and 8700 s, respectively.

We reduced the SDSS J1106+1939 spectra in an identical fashion to the one of SDSS J1512+1119 (detailed in Paper II): we rectified and wavelength calibrated the two dimensional spectra using the ESO Reflex workflow (Ballester et al. 2011), then extracted one dimensional spectra using an optimal extraction algorithm and finally flux calibrated the resulting data with the spectroscopic observations of a standard star observed the same day as the quasar. The resulting flux calibrated spectrum of SDSS J1106+1939 is presented in Figure 1. We only present the UVB+VIS spectrum and present the few additional diagnostic absorption lines detected in the NIR portion of the spectrum in Fig. 2.




Fig. 1.— Reduced and fluxed UVB+VIS X-shooter spectra of the quasar SDSS J1106+1939. We indicate the position of the absorption lines associated with the intrinsic outflow. The VIS part of the spectrum ( $\lambda_{obs} > 5700$  Å) has not been corrected for atmospheric absorption. This does not affect our study since our diagnostic lines are located in regions free of such contamination. The dashed line represents our unabsorbed emission model (see Section 3.1).

### 3. SPECTRAL FITTING

The radial velocity values across the absorption troughs are determined with respect to the systemic redshift of the quasar. Hewett & Wild (2010) report an improved redshift value<sup>2</sup> for these two SDSS DR7 quasars by cross correlating a quasar emission line template to the observed SDSS spectrum. These improved redshifts are  $z = 3.0377 \pm 0.0021$  for SDSS J1106+1939 and  $z = 2.1062 \pm 0.0020$  for SDSS J1512+1119. Note that while the NIR range of the X-shooter observations of J1106+1939 covers the  $H\beta + [\text{O III}] \lambda 5007$  and also the  $\text{Mg II}$  rest frame regions, these portions of the spectrum are located within dense and strong  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  and  $\text{CO}_2$  atmospheric bands preventing us from determining a more accurate redshift from the fit of these emission features. We also examined the expected position of  $[\text{O II}] \lambda 3727$  and found no emission feature in its spectral vicinity.

#### 3.1. Unabsorbed Emission Model

Deriving ionic column densities from absorption troughs requires knowledge of the underlying unabsorbed emission  $F_0(\lambda)$ . In AGNs the UV unabsorbed emission source can generally be decomposed into two components: a continuum source described by a power law and emission lines usually modeled by Gaussian profiles that are divided into broad emission lines (BEL, full width at half maximum (FWHM)  $> 1000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ ) and narrow emission lines (NEL, FWHM  $< 1000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ ).

Due to the presence of strong absorption shortward of the rest-frame  $\text{Ly}\alpha$  emission in SDSS J1106+1939, we fit the continuum in the range  $3200 - 9000 \text{ \AA}$  using a single power law of the form  $F(\lambda) = F_{1100}(\lambda/1100)^\alpha$ , where  $F_{1100}$  is the observed flux at  $1100 \text{ \AA}$  in the rest-frame of the object, on regions longward of the  $\text{Ly}\alpha$  emission suspected free of absorption or emission lines. After correcting the spectrum for the galactic extinction

---

<sup>2</sup>Available online at: [http://das.sdss.org/va/Hewett\\_Wild\\_dr7qso\\_newz/](http://das.sdss.org/va/Hewett_Wild_dr7qso_newz/)

( $E(B-V) = 0.025$ , Schlegel et al. 1998) using the reddening curve of Cardelli et al. (1989) we find  $F_{1100} = 12.8 \times 10^{-17}$  ergs/s/Å/cm<sup>2</sup> and  $\alpha \simeq -0.95$ . We fit the prominent Ly $\alpha$  and C IV emission lines using a sum of Gaussians and a spline fit for the Si IV+O IV] blend. We fit the Fe II and other weak emission lines longward of 1600 Å in the rest frame using a phenomenological spline fit. In the far UV, we build an O VI emission model by scaling and shifting to the proper position the C IV emission line model. The scaling factor is chosen to be the smallest such as no emission remains above the constructed emission model. This approach could strongly underestimate the true underlying O VI emission. We fit the NIR unabsorbed emission using a smooth spline fit. The resulting emission model for the UVB+VIS region is shown in Figure 1. Note that the single power law model for the whole UVB+VIS range most likely provides an overestimation of the true underlying continuum shortward of the O VI emission, a region in which a softer power law is usually adopted (Korista et al. 1992; Zheng et al. 1997; Arav et al. 2001b; Telfer et al. 2002). However, modeling of the unabsorbed emission in that region is not important for our BAL analysis due to the fact that it contains only heavily blended diagnostic lines coupled with a limited signal to noise ratio (S/N).

Given the overall high S/N of the SDSS J1512+1119 data spectrum (S/N  $\sim 30 - 70$  over most of the UVB/VIS range) and absence of wide absorption troughs, we fit the unabsorbed emission lines using a smooth third order spline fit after fitting the derreddened continuum ( $E(B-V) = 0.051$ , Schlegel et al. 1998) with a power law with  $F_{1100} = 77.0 \times 10^{-17}$  ergs/s/Å/cm<sup>2</sup> and  $\alpha \simeq -0.403$  (see Paper II for details).

### 3.2. BAL Column Density Measurements of SDSS J1106+1939

The X-shooter spectrum of SDSS J1106+1939 exhibits wide absorption troughs associated with H I, C IV, Si IV, N V, O VI, S IV/S IV\* and P V ionic species. The C IV absorption trough (and most other troughs as well) satisfies the observational definition of a broad absorption line (BAL, see Weymann et al. 1991). In addition, we identify absorption



at the same kinematic location associated with  $\text{He I}^*$  and the lower ionization species  $\text{Mg II}$ ,  $\text{C II}$ ,  $\text{Al II}$ , and  $\text{Al III}$  (see Figures 1 and 2).

The column density of an ionic species  $i$  associated with a given kinematic component is estimated by modeling the residual intensity  $I_i(\lambda) \equiv F_{obs}(\lambda)/F_0(\lambda)$  as a function of the radial velocity. The simplest modeling technique is the apparent optical depth (AOD) method where  $\tau_i(v) \equiv -\ln(I_i(v))$ , which is then converted to a column density  $N_i(v)$  using the appropriate atomic/physical constants (see Equation 9 in Savage & Sembach 1991). However, our group (Arav 1997; Arav et al. 1999a,b, 2001a,b, 2002, 2003; Scott et al. 2004; Gabel et al. 2005b) and others (Barlow et al. 1997; Hamann et al. 1997; Telfer et al. 1998; Churchill et al. 1999; Ganguly et al. 1999) showed that column densities derived from the apparent optical depth analysis of BAL troughs are unreliable due to non-black saturation in the troughs. In particular, in Paper II we showed that the true  $\text{C IV}$  optical depth in the deepest outflow component of SDSS J1512+1119, is  $\sim 1000$  times greater in the core of the absorption profile than the value deduced from the AOD method.

To account for non-black saturation in unblended doublets or multiplet troughs from the same ion, we routinely use the partial covering (PC) and power-law (PL) absorption models (e.g. Arav et al. 1999a, 2008; Edmonds et al. 2011; Borguet et al. 2012, for details). However, the intrinsic width of most absorption troughs in the spectrum of SDSS J1106+1939 causes self-blending of troughs from most of the observed doublets ( $\text{C IV}$ ,  $\text{N V}$ ,  $\text{O VI}$ ,  $\text{Mg II}$ ,  $\text{Al III}$ ,  $\text{Si IV}$  and  $\text{P V}$ ). As a result, the pure PC and PL methods cannot be used. We therefore rely on the template fitting technique that has been widely used in the study of BAL quasar spectra (e.g. Korista et al. 1992; Arav et al. 1999b; de Kool et al. 2002; Moe et al. 2009, and references therein). The main assumption made when using this technique is that the physical properties of the absorbing gas do not significantly change as a function of the radial velocity for a given kinematic component (e.g. Moe et al. 2009; Dunn et al. 2010). Therefore, the optical depth profile as a function of velocity is assumed to be proportional for all lines so that a single scaled template is used to reproduce the

observed absorption troughs. In the three cases where this assumption was tested (Korista et al. 2008; Moe et al. 2009; Dunn et al. 2010), it was shown to be well consistent with the data. As we will show here, we obtain good fits to most troughs in SDSS J1106+1939 using this simple and restrictive assumption. During the fitting procedure, we assume that doublet lines are not affected by non-black saturation, as a first approximation, and relax that constraint when needed in order to obtain a better fit to the observed line profile. It is important to note that in most doublet and multiplet cases, template fitting can indicate whether the trough is highly saturated or whether the actual column density is close to the non-saturated AOD case (see Moe et al. 2009, for details).

We choose the P v  $\lambda\lambda$  1117.98,1128.01 doublet lines as a starting point for the template building. Our main motivations in the choice of P v are the high velocity separation between its components ( $\Delta v \sim 2700 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ ), and the absence of other strong intrinsic absorption and emission lines in that region of the spectrum. The first step in our template building process consists of matching the blue wing profile of the P v BAL since that part of the trough is not blended with kinematic components from the red line of the doublet. The absorption structure visible in the P v blue wing suggests that more than one kinematic component might be present for the blue transition. Therefore, for our first model we choose the optical depth template of each line to be a sum of two Gaussians G1 and G2 (Model 1).

In Figure 2 we show the result of the best fit to the moderately blended transitions in the SDSS J1106+1939 spectrum using Model 1. The FWHM ( $w_i$ ) and central positions ( $v_i$ ) of the two Gaussians have been fit simultaneously to reproduce the P v BAL troughs. The fit suggests that the blue wing of the P v BAL profile is well represented by a simple model in which the first Gaussian G1 is characterized by  $w_1 = 1150 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ ,  $v_1 = -8250 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  and the second Gaussian G2 by  $w_2 = 2400 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ ,  $v_2 = -10100 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ . An absolute lower limit on the P v column density present in G1 and G2 is placed by using the AOD technique on the blue transition whose profile is known and unblended. Relaxing the 2:1 constraint of optical depth between the doublet lines of P v, we are able to obtain a better

match of the observed line profile at the location of the core of G1 P v  $\lambda 1128.01$  (see first panel of Figure 2) by increasing the optical depth associated with that transition. We place an upper limit on P v column density in G1 by using the PC technique on this 1:1.1 optical depth ratio doublet (see Table 1). This estimation constitutes a hard upper limit since the red P v line of that component is likely blended by the P v blue transition of a lower velocity system (see Model 2) such that the true ratio of optical depth for that system is within 1:2 to 1:1.1.

The optical depth model derived from the P v BAL fit is also able to reproduce a significant part of the blended S IV/S IV\* BAL. The S IV/S IV\* model presented in Figure 2 considers the presence of the resonance  $\lambda 1062.97$  and excited  $\lambda 1073.01$  line (the oscillator strength weighted mean of the blend of the two close-by  $E_{low} = 951 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  S IV transitions, see paper II for details) for which  $\Delta v \sim 2900 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ . Due to the uncertainty in the O VI emission contribution in the blue wing of S IV (see Section 3.1), the column density associated with component G2 for that transition is less certain and could be underestimated by up to a factor of two if we would not have scaled down the shifted C IV emission model. Model 1 is also able to reproduce the absorption profile observed in the other species such as He I\*, Mg II, C II, Al II, and Al III as can be seen in the remaining panels of Figure 2 in which the maximum optical depths are the only free parameters of the models. The fit of these profiles was performed without having to relax the 2:1 assumption for the ratio of optical depth between the strongest and weakest doublet components, consistent with non saturated troughs. We report the column densities derived for each ionic species in Table 1. In He I\*, we do not detect any absorption related to component G2 and report an upper limit on the column density for that component by scaling the Gaussian template assuming that that the noise level could hide a  $2\sigma$  detection for the strongest He I\*  $\lambda 3889.80$  transition. The C IV, Si IV, O VI, N v doublet are both more heavily self-blended than P v and S IV because of the smaller velocity separation between the doublet components, and are much more saturated due to their higher elemental abundance. This prevents us from obtaining reliable fits to their absorption troughs, and only lower limits on their

column densities can be derived. Blending of the N V, H I and Si III troughs prevents us from deriving useful column densities for these species as well (beside the fact that N V, H I must be heavily saturated). We however note that the lower limits derived from the AOD technique for these species are consistent with the predicted values in our photoionization models. We place an upper limit on the column density of the non detected Fe II by scaling the template of each Gaussian to within  $2\sigma$  at the expected location of the Fe II  $\lambda 1608.45$  troughs. We did not use the stronger Fe II  $\lambda 2600.17$  that is located in a region of poor SN at the blue edge of the NIR detector or the Fe II  $\lambda 2382.76$  that is severely blended by a H<sub>2</sub>O atmospheric band.

While Model 1 provides a reasonable fit to the observed absorption profile associated with most of the ionic species, it fails to reproduce the red wing observed in the BAL profile of high ionization species such as P V, S IV+ S IV\* or Si IV (see Figure 2). This observation suggests the existence of an additional kinematic component associated with the high ionization species. In order to better fit the red wing of the high ionization lines, we built a second template, Model 2. This second optical depth template is also composed of two functions: a high velocity Gaussian F2 with identical parameters as G2, and F1: a low velocity modified Gaussian profile. The result of the simultaneous fit, performed with the same constraints as with Model 1, is presented for P V, S IV+ S IV\* and Si IV in Figure 3, and the associated column densities are shown in Table 2. Here the overall fit of the P V BAL is much better, as well as the fit to the S IV+S IV\* profile. The reported column densities are consistent within  $\sim 30\%$  with the one derived using Model 1. While Model 2 provides a better fit to the high ionization P V and S IV+ S IV\* BAL (but also Si IV), the lack of constraints on the shape of the low velocity component template makes the derived column densities too model dependent to be reliable. Moreover, the small fractional difference in column density from that component does not significantly affect the photoionization modeling since the bulk of the computed column density is located in the two main components G1 and G2. For these reasons, we will use the column densities reported in Table 1.




Fig. 2.— Fits to the mildly blended high-ionization absorption troughs (P v, S IV and Si IV), as well as the non saturated troughs (He I\*, Mg II, C II, Al II, Al III) in the X-shooter spectrum of SDSS J1106+1939. Each transition is fitted with an identical optical depth profile whose shape is described by a sum of two Gaussians G1+G2 (Model 1, see Section 3.2) leaving only the maximum optical depths as a free parameter in each fit. G1 is represented by a dotted line and G2 by a dashed line. The full model for the trough is plotted as a solid line. This simple model provides a good fit to He I\* and the low ionization species as well as to the unblended blue wing of the P v absorption. The poor fit of the P v, Si IV+ Si IV\* and Si IV BAL red wings suggests the existence of another component that is not seen in the low ionization species (see text and Figure 3).

Table 1. Ionic column densities in the outflow of SDSS J1106+1939 using Model 1

Ion	G1 (-8250 km s <sup>-1</sup> )		G2 (-10100 km s <sup>-1</sup> )		Adopted <sup>a</sup> (G1+G2) (10 <sup>12</sup> cm <sup>-2</sup> )
	AOD	PC	AOD	PC	
	(10 <sup>12</sup> cm <sup>-2</sup> )	(10 <sup>12</sup> cm <sup>-2</sup> )	(10 <sup>12</sup> cm <sup>-2</sup> )	(10 <sup>12</sup> cm <sup>-2</sup> )	
He I*	450 <sup>+40</sup> <sub>-30</sub>	480 <sup>+200</sup> <sub>-20</sub>	< 140	...	480 <sup>+340</sup> <sub>-20</sub>
C II	510 <sup>+30</sup> <sub>-20</sub>	...	220 <sup>+40</sup> <sub>-20</sub>	...	730 <sup>+50</sup> <sub>-30</sub>
C II*	980 <sup>+30</sup> <sub>-20</sub>	...	530 <sup>+40</sup> <sub>-30</sub>	...	1500 <sup>+50</sup> <sub>-40</sub>
Al II	16 <sup>+1</sup> <sub>-1</sub>	...	< 7.1	...	16 <sup>+8</sup> <sub>-1</sub>
Al III	240 <sup>+10</sup> <sub>-10</sub>	250 <sup>+10</sup> <sub>-10</sub>	180 <sup>+10</sup> <sub>-10</sub>	180 <sup>+15</sup> <sub>-10</sub>	430 <sup>+20</sup> <sub>-10</sub>
P V	1300 <sup>+30</sup> <sub>-20</sub>	4500 <sup>+900</sup> <sub>-150</sub>	1900 <sup>+30</sup> <sub>-30</sub>	2700 <sup>+1700</sup> <sub>-50</sub>	3200–9900 <sup>b</sup>
S IV	38000 <sup>+22000</sup> <sub>-1100</sub> c	...	5200 <sup>+100</sup> <sub>-100</sub>	...	44000 <sup>+22000</sup> <sub>-1100</sub>
S IV*	16000 <sup>+300</sup> <sub>-200</sub>	...	2500 <sup>+100</sup> <sub>-100</sub>	...	19000 <sup>+300</sup> <sub>-200</sub>
Mg II	140 <sup>+10</sup> <sub>-10</sub>	140 <sup>+10</sup> <sub>-10</sub>	84 <sup>+5</sup> <sub>-5</sub>	85 <sup>+36</sup> <sub>-3</sub>	290 <sup>+40</sup> <sub>-10</sub>
Fe II	< 160	...	< 370	...	< 540

a) Column density values adopted for photoionization modeling (see Section 4).

b) The range translates the uncertainty on the P V column density due to the possible non black saturation affecting component G1 (see text).

c) The upper error for the black S IV G1 component has been computed by finding the maximum optical depth that can be hidden until the wings of component G1 become too broad for the observed line profile.

Table 2. Ionic column densities in the outflow of SDSS J1106+1939 using Model 2

Ion	F1 (-8250 km s <sup>-1</sup> )		F2 (-10100 km s <sup>-1</sup> )	
	AOD	PC	AOD	PC
	(10 <sup>12</sup> cm <sup>-2</sup> )	(10 <sup>12</sup> cm <sup>-2</sup> )	(10 <sup>12</sup> cm <sup>-2</sup> )	(10 <sup>12</sup> cm <sup>-2</sup> )
P V	3300 <sup>+40</sup> <sub>-30</sub>	5700 <sup>+3200</sup> <sub>-110</sub>	1800 <sup>+30</sup> <sub>-30</sub>	2400 <sup>+320</sup> <sub>-30</sub>
S IV	47000 <sup>+4200</sup> <sub>-1200</sub>	...	5500 <sup>+560</sup> <sub>-140</sub>	...
S IV*	26000 <sup>+300</sup> <sub>-300</sub>	...	2900 <sup>+530</sup> <sub>-130</sub>	...

We presented two phenomenological decomposition of the BAL profiles that allows us to estimate the column densities associated with S IV and S IV\* to better than within 50% (see Table 1 and 2). The larger uncertainty affecting the S IV column density in the resonance state has been estimated by scaling the G1 template so that the wings of the model are no longer consistent with the observed profile. In the last column of Table 1, we report the adopted column densities for the photoionization modeling. For photoionization modeling we choose to sum components G1 and G2 for the following reason: The ratio of almost all ionic column density of the same ions is roughly 2:1 between G1 and G2, suggesting very similar photoionization solution. The exception is S IV where the ratio is  $\sim 7$ . However as we noted above, this is mainly due to our choice of a minimal O VI BEL. If we choose an O VI BEL as strong as the C IV BEL the column density of S IV doubles and triples if we choose a 1.5 times stronger O VI BEL. This will make the S IV ratio between components G1 and G2  $\sim 3.5$  and  $\sim 2$  respectively. We therefore conclude that it is highly plausible that both components arise from the same outflow and have similar ionization equilibria, which justify adding them together for the purpose of photoionization modelling and the extraction of the physical parameters of the outflow. When available, we choose to use the value reported in the PC column as the measurement. If only AOD determination is available, we will consider the reported value minus the error as a lower limit during the photoionization analysis since conceptually no information about non-black saturation effects can be obtained from singlet lines. For P V, due to uncertainty in the column density associated with component G1, we report the range of values that are allowed within the absolute lower and upper limits placed on the column density.

The template decomposition also demonstrates the detection of a S IV\* BAL outflow and the fact that the column density associated with the excited state is lower than the one measured in the resonance level. The detection of the S IV\* BAL is secured by the good kinematic match of the template fit. Furthermore, if that part of the profile would have been related to another low velocity S IV system rather than S IV\*, then no kinematic match would be observed with not only P V, but also with higher abundance species like C IV, O VI

or N v that would have likely been heavily saturated.

We note that the observation of absorption associated with the low ionization Al III and Si III lines suggests the presence of absorption due to the Fe III  $\lambda$  1122.524 blending with the P v BAL line. Such a blend could affect the P v column density derived during our template fitting procedure if the Fe III column density was significant enough. The photoionization model presented for the SDSS J1106+1939 outflow in Section 4 predict an optical depth  $\tau < 0.1$  for that Fe III line, which does not affect our P v column density determination.

### 3.3. Column Density in SDSS J1512+1119

Our second target, SDSS J1512+1119, displays a C IV absorption trough whose width is close to a BAL ( $\Delta v \sim 1700 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ , see Paper II). However, the Si IV lines are narrow enough and unblended ( $\Delta v \sim 2000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ ) to be adopted as a template to identify the kinematic components in other ionic species. Using that template, we reported in Paper II the existence of five main kinematic components with centroids at velocities of  $v \sim -2100$ ,  $-1850$ ,  $-1500$ ,  $-1050$ , and  $-520 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  (labeled component 1–5). In this paper we concentrate on determining the distance and energetics associated with the two main components: component 2 and 4. As shown in Figure 4 in which we use the Si IV  $\lambda$ 1393.76 line as template, absorption troughs associated with S IV and S IV\* are observed in kinematic component 2 ( $v \sim -1850 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ ) and S IV absorption is also detected in kinematic component 4 ( $v \sim -1050 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ ). The in depth analysis of the S IV and S IV\* troughs performed in Paper II revealed that the blend affecting the red wing of the component 2 in S IV\*  $\lambda$ 1072.97 is identified as the ten times weaker transition of S IV\*  $\lambda$ 1073.51. This allowed us to derive reliable estimates of  $N(\text{S IV}) \sim 10600_{-2700}^{+4000} \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-2}$  and  $N(\text{S IV}^*) \sim 16000_{-1300}^{+5000} \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-2}$  for that component.

For component 4, we estimate the S IV column density by using the AOD model on the normalized line profile (i.e.  $\tau(v) = -\ln(I_i(v))$ ), converting it to column densities and






Fig. 3.— Fitting the high ionization P v, SIV+SIV\* and SiIV BAL profiles with the Model 2 optical depth profile. As for Model 1, the optical depth distribution associated with a transition is assumed to be known, leaving only the maximum optical depths of each components as a free parameter in each fit. Model 2 is composed of a sum of two functions: F1 (a Gaussian with a modified red wing) represented by a dotted line and F2 (a Gaussian with identical parameters as G2) represented by a dashed line. The total model for the trough is plotted as a solid line. For P v the fit requires a ratio of optical depth between both components of the doublets of 1:1.1, suggesting the possibility of moderate non-black saturation.

integrate it over the trough to obtain a lower limit of  $N(\text{Si IV}) \geq 263 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ . We do not detect an absorption trough associated with  $\text{Si IV}^*$  for that component, so we report an upper limit on the column density for that transition by scaling the  $\text{Si IV}$  template, assuming that the noise could hide up to a  $2 \sigma$  detection and find  $N(\text{Si IV}^*) \leq 25 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ . Due to the narrowness of the line profile and absence of significant blending, we are able to measure the  $\text{Si IV}$  column density and place limits on the ionic column for other species that we report in Table 3. The constraints derived from the  $\text{C IV}$  and  $\text{O VI}$  column densities are consistent with the one obtained from the  $\text{N V}$  and are not reported in the table. We finally place an upper limit on the  $\text{P V}$  column density of  $N(\text{P V}) < 8.1 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-2}$  due to its non detection in that component.

#### 4. PHOTOIONIZATION ANALYSIS

We use photoionization models in order to determine the ionization equilibrium of the outflow, its total hydrogen column density ( $N_H$ ), and to constrain its metallicity. The ionization parameter

$$U_H \equiv \frac{Q_H}{4\pi R^2 c n_H}, \quad (1)$$

(where  $Q_H$  is the source emission rate of hydrogen ionizing photons,  $R$  is the distance to the absorber from the source,  $c$  is the speed of light, and  $n_H$  is the hydrogen number density) and  $N_H$  of the outflow are determined by self-consistently solving the ionization and thermal balance equations with version c08.00 of the spectral synthesis code Cloudy, last described in Ferland et al. (1998). We assume a plane-parallel geometry for a gas of constant  $n_H$  and initially choose solar abundances as given in Lodders et al. (2009). Given the lack of observational constraints in wavebands outside the X-shooter spectral range for both objects, we choose the UV-soft spectral energy distribution (SED) model for high luminosity radio quiet quasars described in Dunn et al. (2010). The use of this SED model, lacking the so-called big blue bump from the classical MF87 SED (Mathews & Ferland 1987), is motivated by the rather soft FUV slopes observed by Telfer et al. (2002) over a




Fig. 4.— Identification of the SIV and SIV\* intrinsic absorption troughs in the spectrum of SDSS J1512+1119. The red wing of the troughs associated with component 2 of SIV\*  $\lambda$ 1072.97 is mainly affected by a blend due to the SIV\*  $\lambda$ 1073.51 transition of component 2, that allowed us to pinpoint the SIV\* column density for that component (see Paper II).

large sample of HST spectra of typical radio quiet quasars (see Dunn et al. 2010, for a detailed discussion). Using this SED, we generate a grid of models by varying  $N_H$  and  $U_H$ . Ionic column densities predicted by the models are tabulated and compared with the measured values in order to determine the models that best reproduce the data.

#### 4.1. SDSS J1106+1939

We compare the ionic column densities given in the last column of Table 1 (see discussion in Section 3.2) with predictions of photoionization models, and use  $n_H = 10^4 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ , which we measure for the outflow using the ratio of S IV/S IV\* ionic column densities (see Section 5.1.1). We focus our modeling on the troughs from the high ionization species He I\*, P V, and S IV, as these are the dominant species in the outflow, and S IV is the species that allows us to constrain  $R$  (see Section 5.1.1). We treat He I\* as a high ionization species since its concentration depends linearly on the fraction of He II in the gas (see e.g. Arav et al. 2001a).

In Figure 5, contours where model predictions match the measured ionic column densities are plotted in the  $N_H - U_H$  plane. Note that we use the average of the range of values given for P V in component G1 and include the upper and lower limits in the error to reflect the uncertainty on the exact column density in that component (see Section 3.2). The best-fit model is parametrized by  $\log(U_H) = 0.0 \pm 0.2$ , and  $\log(N_H) = 22.8 \pm 0.2 \text{ cm}^{-2}$ . The errors are determined by the region where P V and S IV bands cross and are correlated, with higher ionization parameters corresponding to higher total column densities. Comparison of measured and predicted ionic column densities are given in Table 4. As can be seen from Table 4, the best model predicts the column densities of the high ionization species to within a factor of 2. The poor fit to C II and Al III is not physically troubling for the following reasons: First, as stated above, we purposefully attempted to find the best fit for the dominant high ionization species in the outflows. Second, within the reported error bars for  $N_H - U_H$  we can find solutions that yield a much better fit for these two ions. For

example, a model with  $\log(U_H) = -0.2$  and  $\log(N_H) = 22.85 \text{ cm}^{-2}$  produces both the C II and Al III column densities to better than a factor of two, with only a moderate worsening of the high ionization lines fit. The drastic changes in the column densities of the singly ionized species is due to the proximity of the solution to the hydrogen ionization front (see Korista et al. 2008).

The analysis above relies on the assumption of solar abundances. However, AGN outflows are known to have moderate supersolar metallicities (e.g., QSO J2233-606:  $Z \simeq 4Z_\odot$ , Gabel et al. 2006; Mrk 279:  $Z \simeq 2Z_\odot$ , Arav et al. 2007; SDSS J1512+1119  $Z_\odot \lesssim Z \lesssim 4Z_\odot$ , Paper II). We therefore investigate how sensitive our results are to higher metallicity models. Comparing the S IV line on the grid models to that of He I\*, we find that the abundance of sulphur must be  $\lesssim 4$  times its solar value. This is because the abundance of helium is relatively insensitive to changes in the metallicity of the plasma (within  $\approx 8 - 13\%$  of hydrogen for  $Z \lesssim 4Z_\odot$ ), and He I\* is underpredicted compared with S IV for higher sulphur abundances. We therefore run a grid of models using a metallicity of 4 times solar, which is consistent with the results of the works cited above for other AGN outflows. Our elemental abundances for the supersolar metallicity model are determined by scaling C, N, O, Mg, Si, Ca, and Fe as in Ballero et al. (2008) while the remaining metals are scaled as in Cloudy starburst models. The computed models are shown in Figure 6 in which the best-fit model for  $Z = 4Z_\odot$  is characterized by  $\log(U_H) = -0.5_{-0.2}^{+0.3}$ , and  $\log(N_H) = 22.1_{-0.1}^{+0.3} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ . The quoted errors on  $U_H$  and  $N_H$  are determined in a similar fashion to the solar metallicity case. We consider this model to be the most physically plausible for SDSS J1106+1939, while at the same time it provides a more conservative (lower) estimate for the kinetic luminosity of this outflow (see Section 5). In Section 6.2, we explore the sensitivity of the photoionization solution to a different SED.

Table 3. Ionic column densities associated with component 4 of the SDSS J1512+1119 outflow.

Ion	AOD ( $10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ )	PC ( $10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ )
H I	$\geq 1427^{\text{a}}$	...
N V	$\geq 1270$	...
Si III	$\geq 5.7$	...
Si IV	$72.1_{-1.0}^{+1.0}$	$119_{-6}^{+18}$
S IV	$\geq 263$	
S IV*	$\leq 25$	...

a) Obtained through AOD modeling of the Ly $\beta$  absorption profile.

Table 4. Results of the photoionization modeling for SDSS J1106+1939

Model	$Z_{\odot}$	$4 Z_{\odot}$
Ion	$\log\left(\frac{N_{\text{mod}}}{N_{\text{obs}}}\right)$	$\log\left(\frac{N_{\text{mod}}}{N_{\text{obs}}}\right)$
He I*	0.37	0.08
C II	-1.83	-1.32
Al II	-1.81	-0.74
Al III	-0.58	-0.02
Mg II	-0.09	0.11
P V	-0.04	-0.09
S IV	-0.03	0.34




Fig. 5.— Photoionization modeling of the outflow in SDSS J1106+1939 assuming solar abundances. The shaded regions represents the locus of points  $(U_H, N_H)$  able to reproduce the observed ionic column density for a given species (see Table 1); dashed lines represent an upper limit on the column density of the ion; and dotted dashed lines represent a lower limit on the column density. The best model is marked by a diamond and the systemic error on the solution is represented by the cross. For clarity we do not represent the AlII line since it is co-spatial with the CII line.




Fig. 6.— Photoionization modeling of the outflow in SDSS J1106+1939 assuming a metallicity  $Z/Z_{\odot} = 4$ . The description of the figure is identical to Figure 5.



## 4.2. SDSS J1512+1119

Component 2 of the outflow of SDSS J1512+1119 was analyzed in Paper II. We found  $\log(U_H) \approx -0.9_{-0.1}^{+0.1}$  and  $\log(N_H) \approx 21.9_{-0.1}^{+0.1}$  for the UV-soft SED. Using the SED developed in Mathews & Ferland (1987), we found the ionization parameter and column density dropped by  $\approx 0.2$  and  $0.3$  dex, respectively. We determined the metallicity of the gas was approximately solar with an upper limit of about 4 times solar.

For component 4 of this outflow, Si IV is the only ion for which we have a column density measurement. However, as seen in Figure 7, the upper and lower limits of other ions help constrain the models. Lower limits on N V and S IV along with the upper limit on P V constrain the solution to be located within the region interior to these lines in Figure 7. The solutions then lie along the the Si IV band within that region, with  $-1.7 \lesssim \log(U_H) \lesssim -1.4$  and  $19.8 \lesssim \log(N_H) \lesssim 20.4$  ( $\text{cm}^{-2}$ ).

## 5. ESTIMATING THE DISTANCE AND ENERGETICS OF THE S IV OUTFLOWS

Assuming that the absorbing material can be described as a thin ( $\Delta R/R \ll 1$ ), partially-filled shell, the mass flow rate ( $\dot{M}$ ) and kinetic luminosity ( $\dot{E}_k$ ) of the outflow are given by (see discussion in Borguet et al. 2012):

$$\dot{M} = 4\pi R\Omega\mu m_p N_H v \quad (2)$$

$$\dot{E}_k = 2\pi R\Omega\mu m_p N_H v^3, \quad (3)$$

where  $R$  is the distance of the outflow from the central source,  $\Omega$  is the global covering fraction of the outflow,  $\mu = 1.4$  is the mean atomic mass per proton,  $m_p$  is the mass of the proton,  $N_H$  is the total hydrogen column density of the absorber, and  $v$  is the radial velocity of the kinematic component, which is directly derived from the trough’s profile. In the rest of this section, we detail the determinations of (or constraints on)  $R$  and  $\Omega$  that are needed for calculating  $\dot{M}$  and  $\dot{E}_k$ .




Fig. 7.— Photoionization modeling of component 4 of the outflow in SDSS J1512+1119 assuming solar abundances. As in Figure 5, a measured column density is represented by a shaded area (showing the uncertainties), an upper limit on a column density is represented by a dashed line and a lower limit by a dotted dashed line. The region of the phase space in which models are able to reproduce the observed constraints is roughly delimited by the trapezium.

## 5.1. Determining $R$ : the Distance of the Outflow from the Central Source

Measuring  $R$  is crucial for estimating of  $\dot{M}$  and  $\dot{E}_k$ , and is also essential for understanding the relationship of the outflows with the host galaxy and its surroundings. In Section 4, we derived the ionization parameter ( $U_H$ ) for each outflow. Therefore, a knowledge of  $n_H$  and  $Q_H$  allows us to solve for  $R$  directly from Equation (1).

### 5.1.1. Determining $n_H$

In highly ionized plasma the hydrogen number density is related to the electron number density through  $n_e \simeq 1.2 n_H$ . Under the assumption of collisional excitation, the ratio of level populations between S IV\* (E=951 cm<sup>-1</sup>) and S IV(E=0 cm<sup>-1</sup>) provides a direct probe of  $n_e$ . Using the column densities for S IV and S IV\* reported in Tables 1 and 3 and the electron temperature found for our best-fit Cloudy models (10,000 K, a weighted average for S IV across the slab), we find  $\log(n_e) = 4.11_{-0.37}^{+0.02}$  cm<sup>-3</sup> for SDSS J1106+1939 and  $\log(n_e) \leq 3.34$  cm<sup>-3</sup> for component 4 of the SDSS J1512+1119 outflow (see Figure 8). The errors quoted on the electron number densities are computed from the uncertainties on the S IV and S IV\* column densities. In Paper II we showed that no information about  $n_e$  could be directly derived from the line profile of S IV and S IV\* for component 2 of the SDSS J1512+1119 outflow. We therefore used the ratio of population between excited states of C III\*  $\lambda 1175$  to constrain the electronic density and found  $\log(n_e) = 5.4_{-0.6}^{+2.7}$  cm<sup>-3</sup>.

### 5.1.2. Determining $Q_H$ and $L_{Bol}$

We compute  $Q_H$  as well as the bolometric luminosity  $L_{Bol}$  for each object by fitting the UV-soft SED to the measured flux (corrected for Galactic reddening) at 1100 Å (in the rest-frame) and following the procedure outlined in Dunn et al. (2010). We obtain  $\log Q_H = 57.1$  s<sup>-1</sup> and  $\log L_{Bol} = 47.2$  erg s<sup>-1</sup> for SDSS J1106+1939 and  $\log Q_H = 57.4$  s<sup>-1</sup>




Fig. 8.— Density diagnostic (and errors) for SDSS J1106+1939 and kinematic component 4 of the SDSS J1512+1119 outflow. We plot the theoretical ratio of the level population of the first excited states of S IV ( $E = 951 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ ) to the level population of the ground state versus the electron number density  $n_e$  for three representative temperatures. The density diagnostic provided is fairly temperature independent for the range of densities represented in this plot. We determine the electron number density associated with the two outflows using the curve for the temperature of 10,000 K found for our best-fit Cloudy models (see text).

and  $\log L_{Bol} = 47.6 \text{ erg s}^{-1}$  for SDSS J1512+1119.

## 5.2. Constraining $\Omega$

For a full discussion about constraining  $\Omega$  that is needed for Equations (2) and (3), we refer the reader to Section 5.2 in Dunn et al. (2010). Here we reproduce the main arguments and then concentrate on the case of SIV outflows. There is no direct way to obtain the  $\Omega$  of a given outflow from its spectrum as we only see the material located along the line of sight. Therefore, the common procedure is to use the fraction of quasars that show outflows as a proxy for  $\Omega$ . Statistically, CIV BALs are seen in 20% of all quasars (e.g. Hewett & Foltz 2003), and therefore an  $\Omega = 0.2$  is used for high ionization outflows. Since the ratio of CIV and SIV ionic fraction as a function of  $U_H$  is relatively constant (see Paper I) they arise from the same photoionized plasma. Therefore, we can simply choose  $\Omega = 0.2$  for the SIV outflows. However, to be more conservative we will multiply the CIV  $\Omega$  by the fraction of CIV BALQSOs that show corresponding SIV troughs. The rationale for this is that, being a less abundant ion than CIV, SIV may only arise in high  $N_H$  outflows and therefore a correction factor to that effect may be needed.

We only compare BAL outflows for two reasons. First, the SIV troughs are located within the Lyman forest. The spectral coverage of the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS) can show these SIV/SIV\* troughs only for redshifts  $z > 2.8$ , where the forest is very thick and greatly complicates the identification of narrow SIV troughs. Second, the CIV outflows in both SDSS J1106+1939 and SDSS J1512+1119 adhere to the BAL definition (Weymann et al. 1991), and therefore the comparison should be made with BALs only. We note that narrower CIV absorption is much more prevalent in quasars, up to 60% of all objects (see Ganguly & Brotherton 2008), and therefore their  $\Omega$  should be larger accordingly.

The sample we showed in Paper I (their Table 1) contains 24 objects that show appreciable CIV absorption. From these 24 objects, 15 show a CIV BAL trough (again

using the Weymann et al. 1991 definition). In Paper I, we identified clear cases of S IV/S IV\* outflows in three of these objects. This was done using the very restrictive criterion of matching a Si IV absorption template to both S IV and S IV\* troughs (see Paper I, Figure 1). However, for our purposes here, we need to account for both pure S IV outflow (since low density outflows may not show S IV\* even when S IV absorption is unambiguous) and also cases where the S IV and S IV\* are so wide that they blend into one trough. We find 3 such strong cases: SDSS J0844+0503 that shows roughly 4000 km s<sup>-1</sup> continuous S IV/S IV\* trough at the expected velocity; SDSS J1051+1532 that shows  $\sim$  6000 km s<sup>-1</sup> continuous S IV/S IV\* trough at the expected velocity; and SDSS J1503+3641 that shows a good kinematic match for both S IV and S IV\* based on the Si IV absorption template. There are also 3 plausible cases of matching narrower S IV and/or S IV\* absorption features, but we do not include them as the possibility of a false positive identification of unrelated Ly $\alpha$  absorption features is quite significant. We note that the objects we analyse in this paper are not part of the the sample presented in paper I; the SDSS spectrum of SDSS J1512+1119 does not cover the S IV/S IV\* troughs region, and SDSS J1106+1939 is below the magnitude cut-off of that survey.

We thus have a total of 6 secure detections of S IV outflow troughs within the 15 C IV BAL sample. Therefore, a conservative lower limit on the fraction of C IV BALQSOs that also show S IV outflows, is 6/15=40%. We will use this correction factor for the canonical C IV BALQSOs  $\Omega = 0.2$ , which yields  $\Omega = 0.08$  for the S IV outflows.

We thus have a total of 6 secure detections of S IV outflow troughs within the 15 C IV BAL sample of paper 1 (the three objects shown in paper I Figure 1, and the three objects discussed in the paragraph above). Therefore, a conservative lower limit on the fraction of C IV BALQSOs that also show S IV outflows, is 6/15=40%. We will use this correction factor for the canonical C IV BALQSOs  $\Omega = 0.2$ , which yields  $\Omega = 0.08$  for the S IV outflows.

### 5.3. Results

Inserting the parameters derived in Sections 4 and 5 into Equations (1), (2) and (3), we calculate the distance and energetics for the three S IV outflows. These quantities, as well as most of the parameters they are derived from, are listed in Table 5. For outflows where ranges of parameters were determined, we show the corresponding ranges in  $R$ ,  $\dot{M}$  and  $\dot{E}_k$ .

In Table 5 we present 3 different models for the outflow of SDSS J1106+1939:

- Using solar abundances and the UV-soft SED (see Section 4 for details). The advantage of this model is its simplicity and the ease of comparison with any other outflows that are modelled with solar abundances.
- Using solar abundances and the canonical MF87 SED developed for AGN by Mathews & Ferland (1987) (see Section 6.2 below for details), to give a concrete example of the results for a different SED.
- A model with metallicity 4 times higher than solar, combined with the UV-soft SED (see Section 4.1 for details). As noted in Section 4.1, we consider this model to be the most physically plausible for SDSS J1106+1939.

The UV-soft SED we use is the most appropriate given the spectral data on hand, and the chemical abundances for  $Z = 4Z_{\odot}$  give a slightly better fit to the measured column densities than the pure solar case. At the same time, it provides a more conservative (lower) estimate for the kinetic luminosity of this outflow. We therefore use this model as the representative result for the outflow.

For the two separate outflow components of SDSS J1512+1119 (C2 and C4), we show only the result of models using solar abundances and the UV-soft SED. For comparison, we also show in Table 5 the parameters derived for our previous  $\dot{E}_k$  record holder: SDSS J0838+2955 (Moe et al. 2009, but see the correction by a 0.5 factor reported in Edmonds

et al. 2011). We note that  $\dot{M}$  and  $\dot{E}_k$  for SDSS J0838+2955 were derived using  $\Omega = 0.2$ . Therefore, for a fair comparison with the S IV outflows, the SDSS J0838+2955 result should be divided by 2.5 (since for the S IV outflows we use  $\Omega = 0.08$ ).

## 6. RELIABILITY OF THE MAIN STEPS IN DETERMINING $\dot{M}$ and $\dot{E}_k$

Our reported kinetic luminosity ( $\dot{E}_k$ ) for SDSS J1106+1939 is an order of magnitude larger than the previous highest value in an established quasar outflow (SDSS J0838+2955, Moe et al. 2009, see Table 5). Due to the potential importance of this result to AGN feedback processes, we review in this section the steps that were taken in order to arrive at this result. Our aim is to address possible caveats or systematic issues that might affect this result, especially whether  $\dot{E}_k$  can differ significantly from the most plausible value we report in Table 5 ( $Z = 4Z_\odot$  model).

### 6.1. Ionic Column Density Extraction and Their Implications

Reliable measurements of the absorption ionic column densities ( $N_{ion}$ ) in the troughs are crucial for determining almost every physical aspect of the outflows: ionization equilibrium and abundances, number density, distance, mass flux, and kinetic luminosity. A firm lower limit on  $N_{ion}$  of a given trough is produced by integrating the apparent optical depth ( $\tau_{AOD}$ ) of the trough across its width (see Borguet et al. 2012). Since outflow troughs often exhibit non-black saturation, one has to be careful when assessing the actual  $N_{ion}$  of a given trough. As shown in Paper II, the actual  $N_{ion}$  can be 1000 times larger than the value inferred from  $\tau_{AOD}$ . This is the reason why we treat any singlet trough measurements (e.g., Si III  $\lambda 1206$ ) as well as heavily blended doublets (e.g., C IV  $\lambda\lambda 1548, 1551$ ) as lower limits. For wider separated doublets (in our case the important P V and S IV), our template fitting allows for a clear distinction between two cases: a) The fully saturated case where the  $\tau_{AOD}$  of both doublet components is identical within the measurement errors. In such



Table 5. PHYSICAL PROPERTIES OF THE SIV QUASAR OUTFLOWS.

Object	$\log(L_{Bol})$ (ergs s <sup>-1</sup> )	$v$ (km s <sup>-1</sup> )	$\log(U_H)$	$\log(N_H)$ (cm <sup>-2</sup> )	$\log(n_e)$ (cm <sup>-3</sup> )	$R$ (kpc)	$\dot{M}$ (M <sub>⊙</sub> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	$\log(\dot{E}_k)$ (ergs s <sup>-1</sup> )	$\dot{E}_k/L_{Bol}$ (%)
J1106+1139 <sup>a</sup>	47.2	-8250	0.0 <sup>+0.2</sup> <sub>-0.2</sub>	22.8 <sup>+0.2</sup> <sub>-0.2</sub>	4.1 <sup>+0.02</sup> <sub>-0.37</sub>	0.18 <sup>+0.11</sup> <sub>-0.04</sub>	1100 <sup>+700</sup> <sub>-300</sub>	46.4 <sup>+0.1</sup> <sub>-0.1</sub>	15 <sup>+4</sup> <sub>-3</sub>
J1106+1139 <sup>a</sup> MF87	47.4	-8250	-0.2 <sup>+0.2</sup> <sub>-0.2</sub>	22.6 <sup>+0.2</sup> <sub>-0.2</sub>	4.1 <sup>+0.02</sup> <sub>-0.37</sub>	0.29 <sup>+0.18</sup> <sub>-0.07</sub>	1100 <sup>+700</sup> <sub>-260</sub>	46.4 <sup>+0.1</sup> <sub>-0.1</sub>	10 <sup>+4</sup> <sub>-3</sub>
<b>J1106+1139</b> 4Z <sub>⊙</sub>	<b>47.2</b>	<b>-8250</b>	<b>-0.5<sup>+0.3</sup></b> <sub>-0.2</sub>	<b>22.1<sup>+0.3</sup></b> <sub>-0.1</sub>	<b>4.1<sup>+0.02</sup></b> <sub>-0.37</sub>	<b>0.32<sup>+0.20</sup></b> <sub>-0.10</sub>	<b>390<sup>+300</sup></b> <sub>-10</sub>	<b>46.0<sup>+0.3</sup></b> <sub>-0.1</sub>	<b>5<sup>+4</sup></b> <sub>-0.3</sub>
J1512+1119 <sup>a</sup> (C4)	47.6	-1050	-1.7 to -1.4	19.8-20.4	≤ 3.3	4.4-3.1	3.4-9.4	42.1-42.5	<0.001
J1512+1119 <sup>a</sup> (C2)	47.6	-1850	-0.9 <sup>+0.1</sup> <sub>-0.1</sub>	21.9 <sup>+0.1</sup> <sub>-0.1</sub>	5.4 <sup>+2.7</sup> <sub>-0.6</sub>	0.3-0.01 <sup>b</sup>	55-1 <sup>b</sup>	43.8-42.1 <sup>b</sup>	< 0.02
J0838+2955	47.5	-5000	-2.0 <sup>+0.2</sup> <sub>-0.2</sub>	20.8 <sup>+0.3</sup> <sub>-0.3</sub>	3.8	3.3 <sup>+1.5</sup> <sub>-1.0</sub>	300 <sup>+210</sup> <sub>-120</sub> <sup>c</sup>	45.4 <sup>+0.2</sup> <sub>-0.2</sub> <sup>c</sup>	0.8 <sup>+0.5</sup> <sub>-0.3</sub> <sup>c</sup>

a) Solar metallicity model.

b) The ranges corresponds to the upper and lower error bars on  $n_e$ , respectively.

c) Computed using  $\Omega = 0.2$  (see text for discussion).

a case only a lower limit can be put on the trough’s  $N_{ion}$ . b)  $\tau_{AOD}$  of the blue doublet component is significantly larger than the  $\tau_{AOD}$  of the red doublet component within the measurement errors. In that case, an upper limit for the actual  $N_{ion}$  is only a few times larger than that inferred from  $\tau_{AOD}$  and can be measured under the partial covering and/or power-law absorber models (see Arav et al. 2005).

Following these principles, the strength of our 3 most important  $N_{ion}$  measurement in the SDSS J1106+1939 outflow is as follows:

- He I\*: the two measured troughs show an absorption case that is essentially AOD. Therefore, the measurement is very reliable and the small error reflects it’s robustness (see Table 1).
- P v: In our most conservative case, template fitting shows a  $\tau_{AOD}$  ratio of 1:1.1, which due to the quality of the data is still distinguished from the fully saturated case of 1:1 ratio. The 1:1.1 ratio yields a significantly higher  $N_{ion}$  than the AOD case and also causes the large associated error bars.
- S IV: the bottom of the S IV trough is black. Therefore, if our template fitting assumption does not hold here, there is a possibility that we severely underestimate the true S IV  $N_{ion}$ . We note that in such a case the estimated  $\dot{E}_k$  will be larger for two compounding reasons: the first being that the  $N_{ion}$  ratio of S IV\*/S IV will become smaller, reducing the deduced  $n_e$  of the outflow and hence increasing its distance. As can be see in Equation (3) a larger  $R$  yields larger  $\dot{E}_k$ . The second one is that a larger total S IV  $N_{ion}$  will necessitate a larger  $N_H$  in the photoionization solution, which also yields a larger value of  $\dot{E}_k$ .

## 6.2. Photoionization Modelling: Sensitivity to Different SEDs and Abundances

The lack of observational constraints on the incident SED, especially in the critical region between 13.6 eV and the soft X-ray region, motivates us to check the sensitivity of the above results to other AGN SEDs. For comparison we use the MF87 SED developed for AGN by Mathews & Ferland (1987), which is both considerably different than the UV-soft SED used in our analysis due to its strong “blue bump” and also used extensively in the literature. The best-fit photoionization models are parametrized by  $\log U_H = -0.2$  and  $\log N_H = 22.6 \text{ cm}^{-2}$  for MF87, within 0.2 dex of the values obtained with the UV-soft SED. We note that, as shown in Table 5, the derived mass flow rate and kinetic luminosity using the MF87 determined  $N_H$  and  $U_H$  are consistent with those derived using the UV-soft SED to better than 25%. This is due to the functional dependencies of these quantities on  $N_H$  and  $U_H$ , and due to the higher  $Q_H$  associated with an MF87 SED (see Equations (1) and (3)). We conclude that the derived results are only mildly sensitive to other physically plausible quasar SEDs.

In contrast, the derived  $\dot{M}$  and  $\dot{E}_k$  are more sensitive to departure from solar metallicity. A comparison of the results in the first and third models given in Table 5 shows the following: Compared to the  $Z = Z_\odot$  model, the  $Z = 4Z_\odot$  model has 3 times less  $\dot{M}$  and  $\dot{E}_k$ , while at the same time  $R$  is 60% larger (due to the lower  $U_H$  of the  $Z = 4Z_\odot$  model). The photoionization reasons for that behavior are discussed in Korista et al. (2008) and Dunn et al. (2010). We note that since the super-solar metallicity models gives a better solution for the outflow, and the upper bound for the metallicity is close to  $Z = 4Z_\odot$  (see Section 4.1), our representative model indeed yields a conservative lower limit on  $\dot{M}$  and  $\dot{E}_k$ .

### 6.3. Reliability of the Distance Estimate

Our distance estimate is derived from measuring the ratio of S IV\*/S IV column densities. If this ratio is larger than unity there is a possibility that the S IV\* is actually saturated and that the true column density ratio is close to 2. In this case we can only establish a lower limit on  $n_e$  and therefore an upper limit on  $R$ . The converse is true for cases where the S IV\*/S IV column density ratio is smaller than unity, which is the case for our SDSS J1106+1939 measurements. Therefore, the distance we derive for this outflow is technically a lower limit. We note that using this  $R$  value as a measurement instead of a lower limit yields a lower limit on  $\dot{E}_k$  (see Equation (2)). Thus, again our reported  $\dot{E}_k$  is conservative. This point is somewhat different than the argument we presented in point 3 of Section 6.1 above as it holds even if the S IV resonance trough is not black.

### 6.4. Global Covering Factor ( $\Omega$ )

As noted in the Introduction, this aspect is one of the major strengths of the current analysis. Based on the usual statistical approach for C IV BALs, the range in  $\Omega$  for these S IV outflows is between  $\Omega=0.2$  (the value for all high ionization BALs that are represented by C IV troughs) and  $\Omega=0.08$ , which takes into account that only 40% of C IV BALs show kinematically-corresponding S IV absorption (see Section 5.2). For the energetics calculation, we chose the more conservative  $\Omega=0.08$ , which minimizes  $\dot{E}_k$ .

### 6.5. Can The Outflows Hide A Significant Amount of Undetected Mass

The highest ionization species available in our spectrum is O VI for which we can obtain only a lower limit for  $N_{ion}$ . This does not allow us to probe the higher ionization material that is known to exist in AGN outflows via X-ray observations, the so-called Warm Absorber (WA) material. For example, from Table 3 in Gabel et al. (2005a), the combined

column density of the warm absorber in the NGC 3783 outflow is 10–20 times higher than that detected in the UV components. At least in one case, UV spectra of outflows from luminous quasars show a similar phenomenon where very high ionization lines (Ne VIII, and Mg x) show that the bulk of the outflowing material is in this very high ionization component (see Muzahid et al. 2012; Arav et al 2012b in preparation).

It is certainly possible that such a high ionization phase is also present in the SDSS J1106+1939 outflow (and in the other two S IV outflows we report here). In that case, the total  $\dot{M}$  and  $\dot{E}_k$  could be much larger than reported in Table 5 if the WA material is located at the same distance than the UV outflow.

### **6.6. Summary: $10^{46}$ ergs s $^{-1}$ is a conservative lower limit for $\dot{E}_k$ in the SDSS J1106+1939 outflow**

In this section we demonstrated that essentially all possible deviations from our assumptions will lead to a higher value of  $\dot{E}_k$  in the SDSS J1106+1939 outflow: possible higher column density in either S IV or P v; metallicity lower than  $Z = 4Z_{\odot}$ ; the derived  $R$  can only be larger (i.e., if the S IV column density is underestimated); we use a conservative value for  $\Omega$ , using the one associated with the general high ionization C IV outflows will yield  $\dot{E}_k$  larger by a factor of 2.5; the outflow may very well carry a dominant component of high ionization material, to which our rest-frame UV observations are not sensitive; in that case  $\dot{E}_k \propto N_H(UV) + N_H(WA)$ , where  $N_H(UV)$  is the total hydrogen column we are sensitive to using the UV diagnostics in the data analyzed here, and  $N_H(WA)$  is the  $N_H$  associated with the higher ionization WA material.

## **7. DISCUSSION**

The powerful BAL outflow observed in SDSS J1106+1939 possesses a kinetic luminosity high enough to play a major role in AGN feedback processes, which typically require a

mechanical energy input of roughly 0.5–5% of the Eddington luminosity of the quasar (Hopkins & Elvis 2010; Scannapieco & Oh 2004, respectively). This quasar, being bright for its redshift band radiates close to its Eddington limit (i.e.  $L_{Bol} \simeq L_{edd}$ ). Therefore, with  $\dot{E}_k \gtrsim 5\%L_{Bol}$ , it has enough energy to drive the theoretically invoked AGN feedback processes.

How applicable are these results to the majority of quasar outflows? The investigation described here gives the first reliable estimates of  $R$ ,  $\dot{M}$  and  $\dot{E}_k$  for a few high ionization, high luminosity quasar outflows. Previously we only had such determinations for low ionization outflows, which comprise only  $\sim 10\%$  of all observed quasar outflows. Furthermore, the absorption spectrum of these two objects looks very similar to the run-of-the-mill BALQSO spectra longward of  $\text{Ly}\alpha$ . This is an important point as the vast majority of available BALQSO spectra do not extend to wavelengths shorter than  $1100\text{\AA}$  (restframe) and therefore do not cover the  $\text{S IV/S IV}^*$  lines. The phenomenological similarity of the  $\text{C IV}$  and  $\text{Si IV}$  BALs in the objects presented here to the majority of observed BALs suggests that a straightforward generalization of the results may be plausible. SDSS J1106+1939 is the first VLT follow-up observation we obtained from a dedicated search for possible  $\text{S IV/S IV}^*$  troughs. In the coming year, we are scheduled to obtain several more X-shooter observations of such candidates and will be able to shed more light on this issue.

The distances found for the three outflows we report here range from  $\sim 100$  parsecs to a few kiloparsecs. These are similar to the distances inferred for outflows in which the density diagnostic is obtained from the study of excited troughs of singly ionized species as  $\text{Fe II}$  or  $\text{Si II}$  (e.g. Korista et al. 2008; Moe et al. 2009; Dunn et al. 2010), but they are 3+ orders of magnitude further away than the assumed acceleration region (0.03–0.1 pc) of line driven winds (e.g. Murray et al. 1995; Proga et al. 2000). This result is consistent with almost all the distances reported for AGN outflows in the literature. However, the current research expands the claim to the majority of high ionization outflows. We conclude that most AGN outflows are observed very far from their initial assumed acceleration region.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

B.B. would like to thank Pat Hall for suggesting the use of the revised redshifts. We acknowledge support from NASA STScI grants GO 11686 and GO 12022 as well as NSF grant AST 0837880.

## REFERENCES

- Aoki, K., Oyabu, S., Dunn, J. P., Arav, N., Edmonds, D., Korista, K. T., Matsuhara, H., & Toba, Y. 2011, *PASJ*, 63, 457
- Arav, N. 1997, in *Astronomical Society of the Pacific Conference Series*, Vol. 128, *Mass Ejection from Active Galactic Nuclei*, ed. N. Arav, I. Shlosman, & R. J. Weymann, 208
- Arav, N., Becker, R. H., Laurent-Muehleisen, S. A., Gregg, M. D., White, R. L., Brotherton, M. S., & de Kool, M. 1999a, *ApJ*, 524, 566
- Arav, N., Brotherton, M. S., Becker, R. H., Gregg, M. D., White, R. L., Price, T., & Hack, W. 2001a, *ApJ*, 546, 140
- Arav, N., Kaastra, J., Kriss, G. A., Korista, K. T., Gabel, J., & Proga, D. 2005, *ApJ*, 620, 665
- Arav, N., Kaastra, J., Steenbrugge, K., Brinkman, B., Edelson, R., Korista, K. T., & de Kool, M. 2003, *ApJ*, 590, 174
- Arav, N., Korista, K. T., & de Kool, M. 2002, *ApJ*, 566, 699
- Arav, N., Korista, K. T., de Kool, M., Junkkarinen, V. T., & Begelman, M. C. 1999b, *ApJ*, 516, 27
- Arav, N., Moe, M., Costantini, E., Korista, K. T., Benn, C., & Ellison, S. 2008, *ApJ*, 681, 954
- Arav, N., et al. 2001b, *ApJ*, 561, 118
- . 2007, *ApJ*, 658, 829
- Ballero, S. K., Matteucci, F., Ciotti, L., Calura, F., & Padovani, P. 2008, *A&A*, 478, 335



- Ballester, P., Bramich, D., Forchi, V., Freudling, W., Garcia-Dabó, C. E., Klein Gebbinck, M., Modigliani, A., & Romaniello, M. 2011, in *Astronomical Society of the Pacific Conference Series*, Vol. 442, *Astronomical Data Analysis Software and Systems XX*, ed. I. N. Evans, A. Accomazzi, D. J. Mink, & A. H. Rots, 261
- Barlow, T. A., Hamann, F., & Sargent, W. L. W. 1997, in *Astronomical Society of the Pacific Conference Series*, Vol. 128, *Mass Ejection from Active Galactic Nuclei*, ed. N. Arav, I. Shlosman, & R. J. Weymann, 13–+
- Bautista, M. A., Dunn, J. P., Arav, N., Korista, K. T., Moe, M., & Benn, C. 2010, *ApJ*, 713, 25
- Borguet, B. C. J., Edmonds, D., Arav, N., Dunn, J., & Kriss, G. A. 2012, *ApJ*, 751, 107
- Cardelli, J. A., Clayton, G. C., & Mathis, J. S. 1989, *ApJ*, 345, 245
- Cattaneo, A., et al. 2009, *Nature*, 460, 213
- Churchill, C. W., Mellon, R. R., Charlton, J. C., Jannuzi, B. T., Kirhakos, S., Steidel, C. C., & Schneider, D. P. 1999, *ApJ*, 519, L43
- Ciotti, L., Ostriker, J. P., & Proga, D. 2009, *ApJ*, 699, 89
- . 2010, *ApJ*, 717, 708
- Crenshaw, D. M., Kraemer, S. B., & George, I. M. 2003, *ARA&A*, 41, 117
- de Kool, M., Becker, R. H., Gregg, M. D., White, R. L., & Arav, N. 2002, *ApJ*, 567, 58
- Di Matteo, T., Springel, V., & Hernquist, L. 2005, *Nature*, 433, 604
- Dunn, J. P., Arav, N., Aoki, K., Wilkins, A., Laughlin, C., Edmonds, D., & Bautista, M. 2012, *ApJ*, 750, 143
- Dunn, J. P., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, 709, 611

- Edmonds, D., et al. 2011, *ApJ*, 739, 7
- Elvis, M. 2006, *Mem. Soc. Astron. Italiana*, 77, 573
- Ferland, G. J., Korista, K. T., Verner, D. A., Ferguson, J. W., Kingdon, J. B., & Verner, E. M. 1998, *PASP*, 110, 761
- Gabel, J. R., Arav, N., & Kim, T. 2006, *ApJ*, 646, 742
- Gabel, J. R., et al. 2005a, *ApJ*, 631, 741
- . 2005b, *ApJ*, 623, 85
- Ganguly, R., & Brotherton, M. S. 2008, *ApJ*, 672, 102
- Ganguly, R., Eracleous, M., Charlton, J. C., & Churchill, C. W. 1999, *AJ*, 117, 2594
- Germain, J., Barai, P., & Martel, H. 2009, *ApJ*, 704, 1002
- Hamann, F., Barlow, T. A., Junkkarinen, V., & Burbidge, E. M. 1997, *ApJ*, 478, 80
- Hewett, P. C., & Foltz, C. B. 2003, *AJ*, 125, 1784
- Hewett, P. C., & Wild, V. 2010, *MNRAS*, 405, 2302
- Hopkins, P. F., & Elvis, M. 2010, *MNRAS*, 401, 7
- Hopkins, P. F., Hernquist, L., Cox, T. J., Di Matteo, T., Robertson, B., & Springel, V. 2006, *ApJS*, 163, 1
- Hopkins, P. F., Murray, N., & Thompson, T. A. 2009, *MNRAS*, 398, 303
- Knigge, C., Scaringi, S., Goad, M. R., & Cottis, C. E. 2008, *MNRAS*, 386, 1426
- Korista, K. T., Bautista, M. A., Arav, N., Moe, M., Costantini, E., & Benn, C. 2008, *ApJ*, 688, 108
- Korista, K. T., et al. 1992, *ApJ*, 401, 529

- Levine, R., & Gnedin, N. Y. 2005, *ApJ*, 632, 727
- Lodders, K., Palme, H., & Gail, H.-P. 2009, in "Landolt-Börnstein - Group VI Astronomy and Astrophysics Numerical Data and Functional Relationships in Science and Technology Volume, ed. J. E. Trümper, 44
- Mathews, W. G., & Ferland, G. J. 1987, *ApJ*, 323, 456
- Moe, M., Arav, N., Bautista, M. A., & Korista, K. T. 2009, *ApJ*, 706, 525
- Murray, N., Chiang, J., Grossman, S. A., & Voit, G. M. 1995, *ApJ*, 451, 498
- Muzahid, S., Srianand, R., Savage, B. D., Narayanan, A., Mohan, V., & Dewangan, G. C. 2012, *MNRAS*, 424, L59
- Ostriker, J. P., Choi, E., Ciotti, L., Novak, G. S., & Proga, D. 2010, *ApJ*, 722, 642
- Proga, D., Stone, J. M., & Kallman, T. R. 2000, *ApJ*, 543, 686
- Savage, B. D., & Sembach, K. R. 1991, *ApJ*, 379, 245
- Scannapieco, E., & Oh, S. P. 2004, *ApJ*, 608, 62
- Schlegel, D. J., Finkbeiner, D. P., & Davis, M. 1998, *ApJ*, 500, 525
- Scott, J. E., et al. 2004, *ApJS*, 152, 1
- Silk, J., & Rees, M. J. 1998, *A&A*, 331, L1
- Telfer, R. C., Kriss, G. A., Zheng, W., Davidsen, A. F., & Green, R. F. 1998, *ApJ*, 509, 132
- Telfer, R. C., Zheng, W., Kriss, G. A., & Davidsen, A. F. 2002, *ApJ*, 565, 773
- Vernet, J., Dekker, H., D'Odorico, S., Kaper, L., Kjaergaard, P., & Hammer, F. 2011, *A&A*, 536, A105
- Weymann, R. J., Morris, S. L., Foltz, C. B., & Hewett, P. C. 1991, *ApJ*, 373, 23

Zheng, W., Kriss, G. A., Telfer, R. C., Grimes, J. P., & Davidsen, A. F. 1997, *ApJ*, 475, 469